



BAY STATE LAND SERVICES

Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Architects • Geotechnical Testing

Knowledge. Innovation. Results.

**Community Input Meeting Minutes
For The Proposed
DEER HOLLOW
Tax Map – 40/ Parcel – 435/ Lot - 35
Forest Hill, Maryland 21050**

The following is a summary of the Community Input Meeting for the above referenced project held on November 2, 2009 at 6:00pm at 2012 Rock Spring Road, Forest Hill, Maryland 21050.

In attendance: Mr. Mitchell Ensor
Mrs. Naomi Wright
Mr. and Mrs. Drew Shifflet
Mr. and Mrs. Gary McNeeley
Mr. Gene Dedeo, Jr.
Mr. Ronald Starleper
Mr. Brian Shorts
Ms. Deanna Mojarrad
Ms. Beth Mullin
Ms. Jeanie Miller
Ms. Aurora Kahoe
Mr. and Mrs. Joe Krejci

Meeting opened at 6:00 pm.

Mitch Ensor (ME), a Bay State Land Services Representative, introduced the plan stating it is a proposed 25 lot subdivision that has been rezoned to RR. The property is located east of the tower line behind the existing Watervale Farms subdivision. One of the lots is agricultural and is located to the west of the tower line and the existing dwelling will remain. Proposed lots will be serviced by well and septic and on public roadway. State law requires stormwater management be provided for proposed improvements for roadways, dwellings, and driveways. Any impervious surface has to be accounted for and a traffic study will be submitted.

Meeting is open to questions.

www.baystatelandservices.com

Mailing Address
P.O. Box 853
Bel Air, Maryland 21014

Office Location
2012 Rock Spring Road
Forest Hill, Maryland 21050

Contact
tel 410.879.4747
fax 410.420.3949

Beth Mullin (Lot 34 – Watervale Farms) states that her house is now becoming a corner lot and devaluing her home and jeopardizing the safety of her children. Five houses will now butt up against her property line. Can the road be moved from her property line and have they considered putting a house there instead? *ME stated that the layout of the subdivision has to meet zoning and road code. It has to serve the subdivision as well.* Mrs. Mullin asks “with no regard to the existing properties”? *ME stated that a landscaping plan has to be submitted along with the development plan. That’s where we would anticipate putting landscaping and the county requiring landscaping.* Mrs. Mullin stated unless its an eight foot berm that will keep the headlights from shining onto my property than its not sufficient. *ME stated that the non code issues are something that he can forward to the owner and the owner has the option of revising or not revising the plan.*

Aurora Kahoe (Lot 4 – Watervale Farms) Has any consideration been made to move the entrance road and bring it through Grafton Ridge? *ME stated there would be a practicality issue. The owner of Lot 35 – Watervale Farms does not own any of that land so someone would have to sell their land to him for him to put a roadway access there and all of those homes have been built.*

Drew Shifflett (Lot 31 – Watervale Farms) Stated that he loves the existing farm and the setting but has there been any consideration to tearing down the barn and the old house and moving the road through the farm property as opposed to along Beth Mullin’s property? It’s basically proposing that you would make a right turn before Lot 1. Beth Mullin has said that she would rather have houses along her property than the road and if she has to have one that she chooses houses. Can you turn through Lot 1 to have the road rounded off instead of doing the sharp turn?

Leslie Shifflett stated that there is a stormwater management swale that could be moved in front of the swale as your coming down Bear Hollow Ct.

Beth Mullin stated that the best bet would be putting the road at Lot 1 and then you are not affecting the number of lots.

Jeanie Miller lives in the lot across from Ms. Mullin and has eight children and her neighbor has four children that play where the road will come out. Her suggestion would be to put the road at Lot 1 as well.

It is then asked that the Grafton Ridge plat is provided so they can make sure there is no option for the road to come of the Grafton Ridge subdivision. *ME stated that he had no problem showing them that but as discussed earlier there is no option for taking the road through Grafton Ridge*

ME then shows Deanna Mojarrad the Grafton Ridge subdivision in relation to the proposed subdivision.

Drew Shifflett then reverts to the original question asking if putting the entrance at Lot 1 has been considered? *ME stated that he has not sketched it up that way and that he had not been asked to. The owner has approved the current layout and it meets all codes. He will mention it to the owner as a suggestion. He then goes on to say that there are many ways to subdivide land and layout lots.*

Question – When you were hired to take the property and decide what the best scenario would be to maximize, this would be the most feasible design? *ME stated it is a feasible design. Another developer may suggest different options or may see something a little different but the topography and shape of this particular piece of property leaves little flexibility in layout.*

Question – Is it feasible to move the entrance? *ME stated that several things come in to play. One, you have to own the land. Two, the existing road is a public road and three, Department of Public Works looks at the site distance for any proposed roadway. It has to meet a minimum site distance.*

Deanna Majarrad stated that she thought since the land had been rezoned the lots had to be at least two acres. *ME answered that the design standards for RR property are 60,000 square feet and that is roughly 1.5 acres and most of the proposed lots are larger than that.* She then states that it has been noted in the community that their water pressure has gone down. What is the consideration and process that the plan needs to go through to ensure our water tables don't continue to be depleted, and for the record she is completely opposed to this. *ME stated that there has to be a well to support all of the lots and a permit is filed with Maryland Department of the Environment for water appropriation. They review water availability for that region and determine if they feel there is enough water to serve that community. It is a state permit that has to be obtained.* Deanna then asks what type of study is conducted to support their findings and do they have access to that information. *ME answered that MDE does any analysis of the water table in the region and that they can call the MDE Groundwater Appropriation Department.* Deanna asked if that study has been conducted. *ME answered no, not until the subdivision process is worked through and locked down in a design.*

ME then shows attendees where the dwelling, wells, and septs are located on the plan.

Leslie Shifflett – The septic that runs behind lots 7, 8, 20 and 21 looks like they are all running into water retention. Is there a study done about septs and water retention? *ME stated that there is a separation requirement from septs and wells to steep slopes, streams, wetlands, etc. and the plan has to meet those requirements to get approved. From a water source, meaning a stream, it has to be 100ft. and 25ft. from a steep slope.*

Drew Shifflett – Lots 18, 19, 21 going down the east side, do the proposed property lines butt right up against our property lines? Is there some type of buffer or tree lines you as the developer can create? Can you give up 10ft. of depth?

ME at this time points out the existing forest retention area and goes over the ridgelines in relation to the proposed and existing lots.

Drew Shifflett – For the houses that back up, can you give them a buffer? Do the square footages of the lots assume they back up to each other? *ME answered that the lots do back up to each other and there is no requirement to put a buffer in but that does not mean that the owner will not do that.*

Question – Can they take trees out after they purchase the land? Can they go into the Natural Resource district and strip trees? *ME stated that trees can be harvested out of the Forest Retention Area and there is a Forest Retention agreement but it doesn't preclude the owner from harvesting trees.*

Question – What is the cost of rerouting the road? *ME answered that it would be cheaper to do it now.*

Question – Who is accountable for all the water that runs down off the street and onto our property? *ME stated that it is controlled by stormwater management regulations. We are at the first step of this process so we are not sure how the water is going to be controlled yet. The existing conditions of the site today and the proposed conditions of the site when it is built all gets factored in to the design elements of stormwater management. We are not allowed by law to create a problem on somebody else's property. We have to evidence to DPW and Soil Conservation District in our design that we are not pushing a stormwater issue from our property to somebody else's.*

Question – If we want to influence anyone for changes we have the next 30 days to try and accomplish that before the DAC meeting? *Mitch answered that there were no more public meetings after the DAC meeting but all drawings submitted to the County are public record.*

Question – When can we expect to see bulldozers behind our houses? *ME answered that anything he told would have a slim chance of being correct. ME then goes over the approval process.*

The community members stated that the most serious concern and opposition they have is the road entrance at Lot 34. They want it moved to Lot 1.

Question – 25 houses are built; wells are dug and a couple of years later the water table changes, what is the recourse? *ME answered that he is not a geologist, but there is no one who can tell you that digging a well next to another one will make it go dry. Same goes in reverse. It may or may not. All wells will be drilled early on.*

Meeting was adjourned at 8:02pm.

Additional Notes: A preliminary plan was displayed at the meeting.